DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 300 996 EC 211 292

AUTHOR Miller, Ronald C.; And Others
TITLE E.C.I.A. Chapter 1, Part B, Institutionalized Facilities Program, Summer 1986. Final Evaluation Report. OEA Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn. Office of Educational Assessment.
PUB DATE Jun 87
NOTE 23p.; For the 1985-1986 Final Evaluation Report, see ED 289 298.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Education; *Child Neglect; *Daily Living Skills; *Delinquency; Individualized Education Programs; Program Evaluation; Residential Programs; Secondary Education; *Student Educational Objectives
IDENTIFIERS New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

The report documents the evaluation of a New York City program providing instruction in supplementary career education and daily living skills to students (N=335) residing in 11 institutions for the neglected and delinquent. The program objective was that 80% of the students would master 80% of their individual short-term objectives. Data analysis indicated that achievement fell slightly below the objective (78.1%). However, 72.5% of the students mastered all of their objectives and student achievement was positively correlated with attendance. Major strengths of the program were the individualized nature of activities, flexibility, and ongoing educational assessment and planning. Recommendations included: (1) continue to emphasize short-term individualized educational objectives; (2) continue to work with agency staff regarding attendance, student problems, and site-specific issues; (3) invite representatives from a wider range of occupations to speak to students; and (4) increase the number of field trips to local businesses to expose students to the day-to-day activities of various occupations. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

E.C.I.A. Chapter 1, Part B
Institutionalized Facilities
Program

Summer 1986

OEA Evaluation Report

EC 211292

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert Tobias

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

June, 1987

Robert Tobias, Administrator
Judith Torres, Senior Manager

E.C.I.A. Chapter 1, Part B
Institutionalized Facilities
Program

Summer 1986

Prepared by:
Special Education
Evaluation Unit

Ronald C. Miller
Evaluation Manager

Marcia Torres
Evaluation Specialist

Arnold Simmel
Evaluation Specialist

Frances Francois
Evaluation Consultant

Lynn Mulkey
Evaluation Consultant

New York Public Schools
Office of Educational Evaluation
Richard Guttenberg, Director

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

It is the policy of the Board of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, creed, national origin, age, handicapping condition, sexual orientation, or sex, in its educational programs, activities, and employment policies, as required by law. Any person who believes he or she has been discriminated against should contact: Carole Guerra, Local Equal Opportunity Coordinator, Office of Educational Assessment, 110 Livingston Street, Room 743, Brooklyn, New York 11201. Inquiries regarding compliance with appropriate laws may also be directed to: Mercedes A. Nesfield, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity, 110 Livingston Street, Room 601, Brooklyn, New York; or the Director, Office of Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education, 26 Federal Plaza, Room 33-130, New York, New York 10278.

SUMMARY OF THE EVALUATION

Students residing in eleven institutions for the neglected and delinquent received instruction in supplementary career education and daily living skills under the Summer 1986 E.C.I.A., Chapter 1, Part B, Institutionalized Facilities Program. The program, now in its seventeenth year of operation, was directed by the Division of Special Education of the New York City Board of Education and served 335 students aged six to 22.

The Office of Educational Assessment (O.E.A.) evaluated the program's effectiveness. The program objective was that 80 percent of the students would master 80 percent of their individual short-term objectives. Data analysis indicated that achievement fell slightly below the objective (78.1 percent). However, 72.5 percent mastered all of their objectives. Further, student achievement was positively correlated with attendance (r=.71). Since some of the institutions were short-term residences, achievement was precluded for some students. Thus, the objective was essentially met.

O.E.A. consultants observed that activities were individualized, and the program was flexible, a major strength. A wide variety of career education or daily living activities took place. This flexibility was complemented by the effective use of ongoing educational assessment, planning and implementation. Teachers reported that a supportive relationship with agency staff was a major factor contributing to the program's effectiveness.

Recommendations for future cycles include:

Continue to emphasize short-term, individualized educational objectives, taking into account probable length of residence.

Continue to work with agency staff regarding attendance, student problems and other issues specific to individual sites.

Invite more representatives from a wider range of occupations to speak to students.

Increase the number of field trips to local businesses to expose students to the day-to-day activities of various occupations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Program Description	1
	Program Goals	2
	Evaluation Methodology	3
II.	FINDINGS	4
	Student Characteristics and Class Size	4
	Program Implementation	6
	Student Outcomes	10
III.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	15

LIST OF TABLES

		PAGE
TABLE 1:	Total Number of Students Served by Each Institution	5
TABLE 2:	Percentage of Objectives Mastered	11
TABLE 3:	Number of Days of Student Enrollment	12
TABLE 4:	Number of Skills Mastered by Program Students	14

I. INTRODUCTION

This report presents the evaluation of the Summer 1986 E.C.I.A. Chapter 1, Institutionalized Facilities Program. This six-week summer program, now in its seventeenth year of operation, was administered by the Division of Special Education (D.S.E.) of the New York City Public Schools. The program provided prevocational, vocational, and daily living skills instruction to students who resided in institutions for the neglected and delinquent.

The program objective was that 80 percent of the students would master 80 percent of their short-term skill objectives. Results of prior evaluations indicated that the program had been effective in meeting the proposed objective. In 1984, 81.0 percent of the students effectively mastered 80 percent of their short-term skill objectives. In 1985, 80 percent met this objective. In both years, 73 percent of the students mastered all of their skill objectives.

Previous O.E.A. evaluations recommended an increase in the number of site visits by occupational representatives and in class visits to job sites. These activities were successfully expanded during the 1986 summer cycle.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

In the summer of 1986, individualized instruction in vocational and daily living skills was provided to 335 children and adolescents who resided in eleven institutions for the neglected and delinquent. The program operated from July 1 to

August 15, 1986. Instruction took place Monday through Friday for three hours per day.

Some students resided in the institutions because of neglect or emotional handicap. Other students resided for short periods of time in diagnostic centers for the delinquent, awaiting more permanent placement in other institutions. Yet others were delinquents residing in institutions on a long-term basis. The following institutions were served (each institution had one program site except for Pius XII which had two):

Ashford Diagnostic Center
Atlantic Diagnostic Center
Baychester Diagnostic Center
Hegemon Diagnostic Center
Henry Ittleson Center
McDougal Diagnostic Center
Mission of Mt. Loretto
New York Diagnostic Center: Market Street
New York Foundling Hospital
Pius XII Home For Boys
St. John's

PROGRAM GOALS

Students in this program generally had fewer educational experiences than usual for their age. Thus, the students generally had a weaker than average understanding about the relationship between education and future employment possibilities and little knowledge of their own abilities and potential. Goals for the program reflected the needs of this student population:

to help students develop a more positive self-image, including increased knowledge of their own abilities and interests;

to teach students the relationship between education and work;

to teach students to be responsible for their actions;

to enhance social skills in order to prepare students for independent living; and

to teach vocational skills to increase students' employability following discharge from institutions.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The Office of Educational Assessment (O.E.A.) evaluated the program. O.E.A.-trained field consultants visited six sites to observe program activities and interview teachers. They collected data on O.E.A-developed observation and interview forms. In addition, O.E.A. also collected individual student demographic and achievement data to determine if the program objective was achieved. O.E.A. examined the relationship between program attendance and student achievement, and the content of the instruction. The following chapters report the evaluation findings, and recommendations for future cycles.

II. FINDINGS

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS AND CLASS SIZE

The Chapter 1 program provided instruction to 335 students. Table 1 illustrates the total number of students served, by institution. Students' ages ranged from six to 21 and averaged 16. Males comprised 54.4 percent of the population; females, 45.6 percent.

During the regular school year, 89.9 percent of the students attended school on-site at the agency, while 8.4 percent of the students attended mainstream general education or special education programs at neighborhood public schools. The remaining 1.7 percent were not enrolled in any regular school program.

Program class registers ranged from seven to 18 students and averaged twelve. Observed class size ranged from six to 18 and averaged ten. Class size was adequate for instruction, according to teachers.

Reasons for residency as stated by program teachers were neglect (60.8 percent) and delinquency (39.2 percent). The length of residency varied: 44.5 percent of the students resided in the institution for less than six months, 33.4 percent from six months to one year, and 22.1 percent for over one year.

TABLE 1

Total Number of Students Served By Each Institution

Institution	Number of Students	Percent
Ashford	18	5.4
Atlantic	20	6.0
Baychester	24	7.2
Hegemon	64	19.1
McDougal	20	6.0
Market Street	33	9.9
Ittleson	31	9.3
Pius XII		
Site 1	17	5.1
Site 2	20	6.0
Mount Loretto	43	12.8
New York Foundling	24	7.2
St. John's	21	6.3
TOTAL	335	100.3*

*Total is not 100.0 because of rounding.

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

Agency Contact

All teachers established regular contact with agency staff for the purposes of consultation about students' problems, attendance issues, and the exchange of general information. All teachers reported the contact was a necessary part of the program as it ensured its smooth operation. At one site where informal meetings were the norm, the teacher said that an increase in structured meetings would be beneficial.

Teacher Training

Program staff included the coordinator, 23 on-site teachers, and two educational assistants. All attended an orientation session prior to the opening of the program. The orientation included administrative information, techniques to develop specific goals for short-term residents, and an introduction to new materials. The program coordinator visited each site regularly and provided staff training, materials, and suggestions for solving problems. Training provided by the program served to complement the experience which program teachers already possessed. Teachers averaged thirteen years of teaching experience.

Instructional Activities, Materials, and Supplies

Teachers used a variety of methods to meet instructional goals. Role-playing was a major activity. In this non-threatening setting, students learned appropriate responses in job interviews, as well as social situations. People from the

business community visited a number of sites to talk to the students about various occupations, and to answer questions about training and salaries. Students visited a number of local businesses to see first-hand the tasks involved in the day-to-day world of work. Students also read and discussed career materials, viewed video tapes and films, and attended workshops concerning vocational knowledge and skills.

One site was equipped with typewriters and computers. Teachers at this site taught students beginning typing skills. The teachers felt this learning experience would decrease students' fear of failure and enable them to learn other skills once they left the institution.

The activities O.E.A. observed reflected the teachers' descriptions. Field consultants observed students practicing job interviews, working on attitudes, voice modulation, and eye contact. Students discussed proper attire and hygiene during this session. Consultants observed students filling out job applications, Civil Service applications, and driver learner's permit forms. In terms of life skills, students learned how to budget, how to figure various deductions on a payroll stub, and how to make a bank deposit. Other students were learning how to use a subway map to get to a job or job interview on time. Some students received typing instruction.

All instruction was individualized, with group lessons often following or preceding individual tutoring. Teachers utilized a wide variety of materials geared to the variety of needs,

abilities, and interests of the students. These included commercial materials such as the Essential Life Skills Series, typewriter and computer workbooks, and dictionaries. Authentic job applications, Civil Service applications, newspapers, want ads, and magazines were also useful. Lower level students received instruction via sorting boards, gross and fine motor skills crafts, and gym equipment. Nearly all teachers said that materials were plentiful, although one teacher requested computer equipment for next year. All teachers indicated that they had contributed their preferences in ordering materials specific to their population's needs.

Student Records and Assessment

Individual student records were kept at all sites. The records contained test results, work samples, records of progress, teacher logs, and attendance records. One teacher filed pertinent want ads in individual student folders, and another kept notes about the learning styles (e.g., written, oral) particular to each student.

Teachers used three criterion-referenced tests, developed by the Board of Education of the City of New York, to measure student achievement and develop curriculum. They used the Career Education/Prevocational Skills Inventory to assess progress and determine objectives for 227 (67.8 percent) students receiving instruction in prevocational skills. This inventory provided objectives related to work attitudes, and the nature of work, as well as completing job applications, learning consumer math,

etc. The Supplemental Career Objectives Inventory was used to determine achievement and set goals for more capable students who were learning typing skills or preparing for competency examinations. Teachers assessed a total of 142 students (42.4 percent) with this instrument. The Activities of Daily Living Skills Inventory assessed progress for 30 students (9.0 percent). This instrument provided a range of functional objectives for less capable students, such as self-feeding and dressing. Teachers drew on a combination of objectives from any one of the three instruments to develop individualized curricula.

All teachers expressed satisfaction with the instruments. One teacher said they helped the staff focus on specific goals. Another noted that the Career Education/Prevocational Skills Inventory was especially useful in establishing an educational focus for short-term residents.

Physical Setting

Instruction took place in agency classrooms at all observed sites. All sites were adequate for program activities. Sofas were added to the classroom at one site in order to provide an informal atmosphere. This addition proved conducive to increased program attendance. One site came equipped with five electric typewriters and two computers.

Program Strengths and Limitations

Overall, teachers were enthusiastic about the purposes and implementation of the program. They noted that one of the

program's most important strengths was the fact that it provided vocational and social skills training which the students would need in the future. One teacher said that prior to implementation of the summer program, the students had nothing to do during the day. Teachers reported that the program also helped students develop a more positive self image by giving them marketable skills.

Other positive aspects included the field trips to businesses and the visits by representatives from the business community. Teachers reported that these direct contact situations were very successful. Students acquired realistic perspectives on the requirements and routines of specific jobs, and applied this knowledge to other program activities.

Teachers commented that a supportive relationship with agency staff was a major factor contributing to the program's effectiveness. The only negative comment about the program came from a teacher who requested extra paraprofessional help because of the wide range of student ability levels at that site. This teacher said that extra help would allow for more individual attention.

STUDENT OUTCOMES

The program objective was that 80 percent of the students would master 80 percent of their short-term instructional objectives. Analysis of achievement data indicated that 233 of the 298 students for whom complete achievement data were available achieved this objective. This represented 78.1 percent and

fell slightly under the mandated objective. (See Table 2.) Though falling slightly short of the mandated goal, the program essentially met its educational objective.

In order to ascertain reasons for this finding, O.E.A. conducted an analysis of the number of days students were enrolled in the program. Table 3 presents the analysis. Almost 30 percent of the students were enrolled for five days or less; the mean number of days was 10. Since six of the institutions served were diagnostic centers for students awaiting transfer or discharge, their residence was short. Thus, while goals were set for these students, their early discharge precluded meaningful objective achievement.

Further analysis indicated that program attendance was associated with objective mastery, as demonstrated by a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient of .71 ($p<.01$). The longer students attended the program, the more objectives they achieved.

Table 4 illustrates the number of skills mastered by program students. The number of objectives mastered ranged from 0 to 33; the mean number of objectives mastered was seven.

TABLE 2

Percentages of Objectives Mastered
(N=298)*

Percent Mastery	Number of Students	Percent of Students	Cumulative Percent
100	216	72.5	72.5
90	13	4.3	76.8
80	4	1.3	78.1
70	6	2.0	80.1
60	6	2.0	82.1
10-50	9	2.9	85.0
0	44	14.8	99.8

*Sum does not equal total student population because of missing cases.

Over seventy-eight percent of the students mastered eighty percent of their objectives.

Over 70 percent of the students mastered all of their instructional objectives.

TABLE 3

Number of Days of Student Enrollment
(Maximum=30 days)
(N=322)*

Number of Days Enrolled	Number of Students	Percent of Students	Cumulative Percent
26-30	81	25.2	25.2
21-25	34	10.6	35.8
16-20	33	10.2	46.0
11-15	33	10.2	56.2
6-10	48	14.9	71.1
1-5	93	28.9	100.0

*Attendance data were not reported for 13 students.

Slightly over 25 percent of all students attended 26-30 days.

Almost 29 percent of the students attended between one and five days.

Fifty-four percent of the students attended less than half the sessions.

TABLE 4

Number of Skills Mastered
By Program Students
(N=335)*

Number of Skills Mastered	Number of Students	Percent of Students	Cumulative Percent
26-33	4	1.2	1.2
21-25	15	4.5	5.7
16-20	33	9.9	15.6
11-15	50	14.9	30.5
6-10	65	19.4	49.9
1-5	98	29.3	79.2
0	70	20.9	100.1

Almost 30 percent of the participating students mastered from one to five skills.

Almost 35 percent of the students mastered between six and 15 skills.

Almost 21 percent of the students mastered no new skills.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Chapter 1, Part B Institutionalized Facilities Program effectively provided prevocational and vocational education to 335 students who resided in eleven institutions for the neglected and delinquent during the summer of 1986. The program mandate was that 80 percent of the students would master 80 percent of their short-term educational objectives. Evaluation of the data shows that 78.1 percent met this goal. The O.E.A. found this indicates that the program essentially met its educational goal.

Factors which contributed to this outcome included a high rate of transiency in the target population. Some of the students resided in diagnostic centers where they stayed for only a short period of time. As a result almost 30 percent of the students served by the program were enrolled for five days or less. Attendance for the entire population was also low: the mean number of days attended was ten out of a possible 30.

A Pearson-product moment correlation coefficient of .71 ($p<.01$) showed there was a relationship between program attendance and achievement. The longer students attended the program, the more objectives they achieved.

The purpose of the Chapter 1 program was to teach students skills that would be helpful to them following discharge from an institution. Teachers with the support of agency staff attempted to assess and teach skills which fit the needs and the length of residency of the students. For the most part, they were successful. Teachers expanded the implementation of site visits by

occupational representatives and visits to work places. These activities greatly facilitated the program's acheiving its instructional goals. Over 70 percent of the students mastered all their instructional objectives.

Recommendations for future cycles include:

Continue to emphasize short-term, individualized educational objectives, taking into account the probable length of students' residency.

Continue to work with agency staff regarding attendance, student problems, and other issues specific to individual sites.

Invite more representatives from a wider range of occupations to speak to students.

Increase the number of field trips to local businesses to expose students to the day-to-day activities of various occupations.